

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 30, 2006, in which claims 1-7, 9-16, 20 and 21 were rejected, claims 8 and 17-19 were objected to, and claims 22-27 were allowed.

Allowed/Allowable Claims

The Examiner's allowance of claims 22-27, as well as the indication that claims 8 and 17-19 would be allowable if rewritten in proper form and to address objections to those claims, are gratefully acknowledged

Claim Objections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 8 and 17-19 were objected to because of informalities consisting of a lack of antecedent basis for certain terms in the claims. With this Amendment, claims 8, 14 and 21 are amended to provide proper antecedent basis for all terms in the claims, and the objection to claims 8 and 17-19 should accordingly be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102 (based on Andriash)

Claims 1-4, 11, 14-16, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andriash (U.S. Patent No. 6,030,687).

Independent claim 1 recites a dual display system having first and second opposite sides that includes a graphic article providing a first display on the first side of the dual display system in a first lighting condition, and a projection system providing a projected image, series of images or full motion video from the second side of the dual display system to provide a second display on the first side of the dual display system in a second lighting condition.

Contrary the Examiner's contentions, Andriash does not disclose, teach or suggest a projection system that provides a projected image, series of images or full motion video from the second side of the dual display system to provide a second display on the first side of the dual display system in a second lighting condition. In discussing this element of the claim, the Examiner pointed

to element 48 of Fig. 7 and the “second image” disclosed in col. 6, lines 36-52 of the Andriash patent. However, this disclosure refers to “translucent image-forming materials, such as inks, to form a second image which may be applied by any one of the previously identified methods for applying ink to the retroreflective material” (col. 6, lines 49-52). The “second image” disclosed by Andriash is therefore not provided by a projection system, but simply by translucent ink patterned to form an image. Because the recited element of a projection system providing a projected image, series of images or full motion video from the second side of the dual display system to provide a second display is not disclosed by Andriash, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Andriash should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 11 depend from independent claim 1, and for at least that reason are allowable therewith.

Independent claim 14 recites a dual display article for attachment to a window substrate. The article includes a graphic article providing a first display viewable from a first direction in a high brightness condition, and a diffuser screen attached to the graphic article for receiving and displaying a projection from a second direction opposite the first direction to provide a second display viewable from the first direction in a low brightness condition.

As discussed above, Andriash does not disclose, teach or suggest displaying a projection to form a second image. In discussing the diffuser screen element of claim 14, the Examiner pointed to the disclosure in Andriash of “opaque sheet material coated with retroreflective light reflecting particles and a dark opaque color on the reverse side thereof” in the abstract, and “retroreflective sheet material, opaque vinyl containing glass beads, metallizing or other retroreflective particles” in col. 6, lines 20-23, along with 12 and 12a of Figs. 2-8. The Examiner also pointed to the same disclosure of Andriash discussed above with respect to claim 1 for the display of a projection. It is respectfully submitted that opaque sheet material with retroreflective light reflecting particles does not function as a diffuser screen, and it is again noted that the “second image” referred to by the Examiner is not a projected image, but instead is a pattern of translucent ink on the back side of the article (see discussion above with respect to claim 1). Therefore, because

the recited element of a diffuser screen attached to the graphic article for receiving and displaying a projection from a second direction opposite the first direction to provide a second display is not disclosed by Andriash, the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Andriash should be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 16, 20 and 21 depend from independent claim 14, and for at least that reason are allowable therewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102 (based on Hill)

Claims 1-4, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hill (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,805).

Independent claim 1 recites a dual display system having first and second opposite sides that includes a graphic article providing a first display on the first side of the dual display system in a first lighting condition, and a projection system providing a projected image, series of images or full motion video from the second side of the dual display system to provide a second display on the first side of the dual display system in a second lighting condition.

Hill discloses a panel having a transparent or translucent design superimposed on or forming part of a transparent or translucent base pattern. The design is visible from one side of the panel, and a mirror image is visible from the other side of the panel, when a sufficiently high level of illumination is provided on either side or both sides of the panel. In the primary embodiments disclosed by Hill, there is no mention of a projection system that provides a projected image, series of images, or full motion video. The Examiner pointed to elements 16, 48 and 78 in the figures in discussing this element of claim 1, but elements 16, 48 and 68 refer to the transparent or translucent designs that are superimposed on the base pattern of the panel, not to a projection. The Examiner also pointed to the disclosure of a “secondary design” at col. 15, line 53 – col. 16, line 3. Again, this disclosure refers to a design that is superimposed on a base pattern, formed of opaque elements rather than being a projection. See, e.g., col. 15, lines 62-65. These disclosures of Hill do not provide any teaching of a projection system providing a projected image, series of images or full

motion video from the second side of the dual display system to provide a second display, as recited in claim 1.

The only discussion of a projection system in the Hill patent is found at col. 17, lines 39-54. This disclosure states that “An embodiment of the present invention of a projected design onto a translucent base pattern represents an improvement over the prior art, in that the projected design is visible from one side of a panel and a mirror image of the design is seen from the other side ... For example, a panel with a base pattern comprising a white layer may be installed in a retail store window. This base pattern will typically allow visibility in an out of the shop during the daylight or opening hours. When the shop is closed during the hours of darkness, images may be projected onto the panel in the store window from inside the store, for example as a promotional display.”

The noted disclosure of Hill does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention. The Hill patent teaches an alternative embodiment in which a white base pattern, with no image, is provided that allows visibility through the panel during daylight hours, while images may be projected onto the panel during nighttime hours. This embodiment does not provide a dual display, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Hill teaches that in order to provide a projected image, the panel has a base pattern that does not include an image. Because Hill does not disclose, teach or suggest a dual display system that includes a graphic article providing a first display and a projection system providing a projected image, series of images or full motion video from the second side of the dual display system to provide a second display, as recited in claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Hill should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4, 11 and 13 depend from independent claim 1, and for at least that reason are allowable therewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 5, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adriash in view of Hill. Claims 5, 7, and 9 depend from independent claim 1, and for at least that

First Named Inventor: Ellen O. Aeling

Application No.: 10/750,332

-10-

reason are allowable therewith, as claim 1 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Andriash, Hill, or any combination thereof (for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adriash in view of Hill, and further in view of Gehring et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0163722). Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1, and for at least that reason is allowable therewith.

Claims 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andriash in view of Gehring et al, and also as being unpatentable over Hill in view of Gehring et al. Claims 10 and 12 depend from independent claim 1, and for at least that reason are allowable therewith.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if such a call would facilitate the allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 10/2/06

By: *Alan M. Koenck*
Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

AMK

